

Serial No. 10/619,511

Attorney Docket No. 24-008

**REMARKS**

Counsel for the applicants wishes to thank the examiner for the courtesy of the telephone interview on March 3, 2008. The following comprises the required summary of the interview.

Claims 1-9, 11-14 and 16 are pending. Claims 10 and 15 have been canceled. Claims 5-6 have been withdrawn. The applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of this application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 1-4, 7-9, 11-14 and 16 are rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph and second paragraph due to the phrase "wherein the second surface ... is not an adhesive." By way of the above amendment, the wording has been replaced. Support for the amended wording is located in the application as filed, for example, page 11, line 19 to page 12, line 9; page 9, lines 21-23; and page 12, lines 15-17. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-4, 7-9 and 12-14 were rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 2,800,215, Converse ("Converse"). Claims 11 and 16 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Converse in view of allegedly well known art. Independent claims 1 and 3 have been amended. Support for the amended wording is located in the application as filed, for example, page 11, line 19 to page 12, line 9; page 9, lines 21-23; and page 12, lines 15-17. Insofar as the rejections may be applied to the claims as amended, the applicants respectfully request that these rejections be withdrawn for reasons including the following, which are provided by way of example.

Claim 1, for example, recites "a long release sheet; an adhesive layer in continuous direct contact and coextensive with the release surface of the long release sheet; a base material having a first surface and a second surface, the first surface being opposite to the second surface, the

Serial No. 10/619,511

Attorney Docket No. 24-008

first surface being in continuous direct contact and coextensive with the adhesive layer opposite to the long release sheet, the base material being of a different material than the adhesive layer; and a protective material provided longitudinally on and in continuous direct contact with a generally peripheral portion of the second surface of the base material, wherein the peripheral portion corresponds to a portion other than a principally used portion of the adhesive layer, wherein the protective material is provided on both sides of the second surface of the base material spaced apart in the widthwise direction thereof, wherein the second surface of the base material between the protective material is a material selected from the group consisting of (i) polycarbonate, poly (methyl methacrylate), polystyrene, cellulose ester, polyethylene terephthalate, polybutylene terephthalate, polyethylene, polypropylene, polyamide, and polyimide, (ii) an anti-reflection or anti-glare treated film selected from cellulose ester, polyester, polyolefin, polyamide, polyimide, polyvinyl chloride, poly (methyl methacrylate), polycarbonate, and polyurethane, and (iii) a release treated film or paper selected from polyethylene terephthalate film, polypropylene film, glassine paper, clay-coated paper, and laminated paper." Accordingly, there is a protective material on both sides of the second surface, and the second surface between the protective material is one of the recited materials. These recited materials clearly are not tacky materials.

Without conceding that Converse discloses any feature of the present invention, Converse discloses a laminate sheet.

The office action asserts that Converse discloses the invention as claimed. To the contrary, Converse fails to teach or suggest the invention, as presently claimed, when the claims are considered as a whole.

Serial No. 10/619,511

Attorney Docket No. 24-008

MAR 06 2008

According to Converse, FIG. 1, untacky marginal surfaces (14a) are strips which "prevent the ribbon guides, paper guides and other carriage elements ... from catching on the edge of the tacky surface." (Col. 3, lines 68-69, col. 4, lines 2-4.) Converse fails to teach or suggest that "the second surface of the base material between the protective material is a material selected from the group consisting of (i) polycarbonate, poly (methyl methacrylate), polystyrene, cellulose ester, polyethylene terephthalate, polybutylene terephthalate, polyethylene, polypropylene, polyamide, and polyimide, (ii) an anti-reflection or anti-glare treated film selected from cellulose ester, polyester, polyolefin, polyamide, polyimide, polyvinyl chloride, poly (methyl methacrylate), polycarbonate, and polyurethane, and (iii) a release treated film or paper selected from polyethylene terephthalate film, polypropylene film, glassine paper, clay-coated paper, and laminated paper." (Claim 1; see also independent claim 3.) To the contrary, Converse provides, between the untacky marginal surfaces, for "a tacky material (12a)... to provide the front tacky surface adapted to be engaged by the type. This tacky material may be rubber, plastic, or the like material capable of removing ink and/or lint from the type when engaged thereby." (Col. 2, lines 60-64.) Also, "the front surface (12) is inherently tacky to be engaged by the type to remove ink and/or lint from the type when engaged thereby." (Col. 2, lines 50-52.)

Converse fails to teach or suggest, for example, these elements recited in the independent claims. It is respectfully submitted therefore that the independent claims are patentable over Converse.

For at least these reasons, the combination of features recited in the independent claims, when interpreted as a whole, is submitted to patentably distinguish over the references of record. In addition, Converse clearly fails to show other recited elements as well.

Serial No. 10/619,511

Attorney Docket No. 24-008

With respect to the rejected dependent claims, the applicants respectfully submit that these claims are allowable not only by virtue of their dependency from independent claims 1 and 3, but also because of additional features they recite in combination.


The applicants respectfully submit that, as described above, the cited art does not show or suggest the combination of features recited in the claims. The applicants do not concede that the cited art shows any of the elements recited in the claims. However, the applicants have provided specific examples of elements in the claims that are clearly not present in the cited art.

The applicants strongly emphasize that one reviewing the prosecution history should not interpret any of the examples the applicants have described herein in connection with distinguishing over the cited art as limiting to those specific features in isolation. Rather, for the sake of simplicity, the applicants have provided examples of why the claims described above are distinguishable over the cited references.

In view of the foregoing, the applicants submit that this application is in condition for allowance. A timely notice to that effect is respectfully requested. If questions relating to patentability remain, the examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone.

If there are any problems with the payment of fees, please charge any underpayments and credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 50-1147.

Respectfully submitted,



Cynthia K. Nicholson  
Reg. No. 36,880

Posz Law Group, PLC  
12040 South Lakes Drive, Suite 101  
Reston, VA 20191  
Phone 703-707-9110  
Fax 703-707-9112  
Customer No. 23400